

THE MORRISTOWN GAZETTE.

By JOHN E. HELMS.

MORRISTOWN, TENN., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1880.

VOL. XIV--NO. 31.

Entered at the Post Office at Morristown, Tenn., as second class matter.

TERMS OF THE GAZETTE.

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION.—One year (52 issues) \$2; six months, \$1; three months, 60 cents.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.—One inch of space, first insertion, \$1; each subsequent insertion, 50 cents; displayed advertisements will be charged according to the space occupied at above rates.

TO REGULAR ADVERTISERS we offer for superior inducements, both as to rate of charges and manner of displaying their favors.

NOTICES IN LOCAL COLUMNS—10 cents per line for first insertion and 5 cents per line for each additional insertion.

OBITUARY NOTICES, Tributes of Respect and Cards of Thanks charged for as regular advertisements.

ALL BILLS for advertising are due when contracted and payable on demand.

COMMUNICATIONS must be accompanied by the true name and address of the writer in order to receive attention.

THE MORRISTOWN GAZETTE.

Subscription Price, \$2.

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 20, 1880.

We learn from the *Chronicle* that the East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia railroad company have lately received a large amount of fine machinery from a Cincinnati manufacturing company and it is now placed in the company's new car works, near the depot. They have just placed in position a very large planer. It dresses four sides at once, of the largest timbers. They have also a very fine piece of machinery for cutting tenons. Also moulding machines for executing the finest work on finishing passenger coaches. We understand that the company intend establishing first class car works there, and will soon be able to turn out passengercoaches complete. The workmen are now engaged in filling a large order for box cars for the Selma, Rome and Dalton road.

S. F. WILSON.

WHAT SORT OF A MAN HE IS.

The most notable speech of the State campaign was made at Nashville a few nights since, by Col. J. V. Turner, of Gallatin. Col. Turner is a distinguished lawyer, formerly a member of the Arbitration Court for the Middle Division, and was one of the most gallant soldiers in the Confederate army. He is a man of the most unflinching courage, and no man in the State stands above him in point of personal character. So intense was the interest produced by his speech that his immense audience would hardly allow him to stop. In the course of his remarks, he touched upon the record of the bolters candidate as follows:

There were some personal matters in the canvass which he had hoped would be kept out, but, as the circumstances had been distributed all over the State, charging Judge Wright with not paying his debts, and with holding the position to which he aspired, and as he had been denounced publicly for making some statements, he felt that his honor and manhood demanded a statement of facts, which he could prove by records. Wilson owed him to say three notes, given in 1868-9, amounting to \$650, for his education. Wilson owed R. H. Sindle, the hotel keeper at Gallatin, \$500; Charles Peacock, a newsboy, \$42, for newspapers; lively stables, rent, etc., several hundred dollars; and a large amount on Epperson Springs. The question now arose as to whether he could have paid these debts. Col. Turner found that Wilson went to Atlanta in 1875 to prepare a bankruptcy application for his father-in-law, Mr. Seago. The creditors agreed to accept a composition after the application had been filed. For simply preparing the application and arranging the composition Wilson charged a fee of \$2,500. The creditors received a small part of the debt, but Wilson came home with \$6,000, and loaned the \$8,000 out on December 29, 1875. The question arose where did the money come from. He loaned it to a person who did not owe a cent and who had a large amount of money out on interest. He took a note on this amount due in thirty days. As he failed to pay any of his debt at that time, or to discharge any of his obligations, the question now arose as to whether he could have paid these debts. These were matters of record and could be established if denied. It was disagreeable to go into these things, but as a member of the Democratic Executive Committee, he had been denounced, and he was willing to stand or fall by the statements he had made, and was ready and prepared to prove the facts stated.

Col. Turner so deeply interested the crowd, that he attempted several times to cease speaking, but they would not let him, crying out in a roar of voices, "Go on!" "Go on!"

In the course of his remarks, Col. Turner intimated that he had knowledge of other matters respecting the career of Wilson, which he would hold in reserve, and give them an airing in the event of Wilson's denial of the above. That a man with such a record should go about preaching the miserable gospel of repudiation, whose bitter fruits will be public dishonor, shame and incalculable injury to our material interests, is perhaps too natural. The wonder is that he is able to find an audience in Tennessee willing to listen to his communistic ravings. For it is safe to say that if society should become infected with the doctrines which pervade Wilson's harangues, all law, order, peace and decency would be at an end, and anarchy prevail.—*Tribune*.

President Hayes and his party it is announced will not return to the city of Washington until Nov. 7, after the election.

The Congressional Race.

Another Account of the Tazewell Discussion.

TAZEWELL, Tenn., Oct. 7, 1880.

To the Editor of the Morristown Gazette: The anxiously anticipated discussion between the Hon. R. L. Taylor and the Hon. A. H. Pettibone, came off to-day, and, as all expected, was another glorious victory for the mountain boy. Taylor's friends have been a little uneasy as to the vote of Claiborne, on account of the unceasing efforts of some of Mr. Pettibone's friends to arouse the prejudices and partisan feelings of the people.

GARFIELD CLUBS are being raised in nearly every voting precinct in the county. But the people will not be deceived. Every body knows these clubs are gotten up for the exclusive benefit of Maj. Pettibone. And scores of honest Republicans—men who are Republicans because they believe in Republican principles—will not be duped in any such a manner to vote for a professional shlylock and office-seeker.

THE DISCUSSION.

Mr. Pettibone led with a speech of an hour and a quarter; fifty minutes of which was devoted to personal abuse of Mr. Taylor, and the remainder to the war. He made the serious charge that Mr. Taylor was a Democrat, and that he voted with the Rebel Brigadiers. The first of these charges neither Mr. Taylor nor his friends were inclined to deny; and the second seemed to be satisfactorily explained to the Major. But he was particularly anxious to know who he was for President, devoting several minutes of his time to bawling: "I'm for Garfield; who're you for?" In order to please the Major, Mr. Taylor calmly took the stand and with dignified majesty said:

"I'm for Hancock, Gettysburg and the Union!"

This was greeted with such a furor of applause as to confound the speaker so that he seemed not to understand what Mr. Taylor had said and continued to charge the falsehood that "Taylor wouldn't tell who he was for."

To cap the climax and if possible render his miserable effort more detestable, he produced a little mean, dirty affidavit, making the charges that Mr. Taylor in 1863 had forcibly taken possession of some logs that did not belong to him.

This is the first time the Major has ever produced it, and if he is not dead to shame, will certainly be the last. If the whole vocabulary of the English language were to be searched, surely a more scathing rebuke could not be found. Mr. Taylor told the people at that time he was only 13 years old, and turning to the shrinking form behind him, said that those were the words of a perjured scoundrel—an unmitigated, malicious lie, and that he (Pettibone) knew it. Then it was a mark of extreme littleness and meanness, for an aspirant to the Congress of the United States, to resort to such degrading means to secure such lofty ends. Mr. Taylor's speech was eloquent, dignified and logical. He was in the ever-living, moving present; scorning to grovel in the dead scenes of the past; or delve among the bones of departed braves, for whom he has a greater reverence than even his competitor. He was several times interrupted with the applause of earnest, honest men, who recognize in him the people's candidate—the champion of truth and honesty.

Everything will go to ruin, according to Republican authority, if Hancock and English are elected this Fall. So far as the general public are concerned there is no foundation for the statement whatever. That "ruin" will follow that event we have no doubt. It will be confined entirely, however, to the ring plunderers, and others who have fixed themselves like barnacles upon the life-blood from the public treasure. They will be ruined beyond doubt, many of them both in purse and reputation. When the books are finally passed over to the scrutiny and criticism of their successors, doubtless many fair reputations will be blasted forever. This is the "ruin" that many of the ruin shriekers are most anxious to avert, and for the very best of personal reasons.

CHEATING.

Possibly the Democrats are no better than the Republicans in point of honesty.

The Republicans say so. But in experience in counting in an unchosen candidate the Republicans have the decided advantage of the case of Hayes.

No cheating is our motto. It was Mr. Tilden's. Cheating was Hayes's motto.

It gave him the office of President.

All the honor remained with Mr. Tilden.

To Mr. Tilden: Honor and private life.

To Mr. Hayes: Dishonor and the Presidency!

329.

What was it, from Ames I took, Stowed away in my pocketbook, And then resumed my study look?

329.

What was it, when the act seemed very bad, Did I in solemn tones, and sad, Swear that I never, never had?

329.

What did Ames have black and white That showed me up in my true light, And left me in a sorry plight?

329.

What was this proved beyond a doubt The figures for which I sold out, And which I since have lied about?

329.

What, more than any other thing—Than salary grab or paving ring—My downfall at the polls shall bring?

329.

GEN. GARFIELD JUDGED BY A REPUBLICAN.

A few days after the adjournment of the Chicago Convention Mr. H. H. Hadley, an ex-soldier and a life-long Republican, wrote to General Garfield requesting information from him to refute the charges of corruption made against him in connection with the De Golyer and Credit Mobilier affairs. General Garfield replied, stating his willingness to comply with the request and asking on what points Mr. Hadley desired information. A further correspondence followed, which is given herewith, and from which it will be seen that instead of furnishing a plain answer to the charges against him General Garfield sent a number of old pamphlets and newspaper extracts as his only reply:

MR. HADLEY TO GENERAL GARFIELD.

No. 21 PARK ROW, NEW YORK, August 10, 1880.

Hon. James A. Garfield, Morristown, O.

DEAR SIR: Thanking you for your letter of June 26, permit me, as a life-long Republican, a soldier in the war, who was with you at Murfreesboro, a native of Ohio, and one who desires the perpetuity of the Republican party in its original purity, to ask you a few plain questions for the satisfaction of myself and a large circle of my republican friends.

First—Can you not make a more satisfactory answer to the charges brought against you in the "De Golyer matter" than has so far been made public?

Second—Can you not make a more satisfactory refutation of the charges of perjury against you in the Oakes Ames controversy or refer me to some reliable source for the same?

Third—Please do me the favor to state before which bar you were admitted as a lawyer, and the date.

These questions entering largely into the present campaign, I claim the right, as an American citizen, a voter, a soldier through the war, a native of your own State and an earnest and conscientious Republican, to a candid and early answer. Awaiting your reply, yours, respectfully,

H. H. HADLEY.

GENERAL GARFIELD TO MR. HADLEY.

MENTON, O., August 12, 1880.

MR. H. H. HADLEY, 21 Park Row, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of August 18 I send some documents which I think answers your inquiries. I want you please read them carefully and let me have your opinion in regard to their merits in answering the charges made against me. Very truly yours,

J. A. GARFIELD.

MR. HADLEY TO GENERAL GARFIELD.

No. 21 PARK ROW, NEW YORK, September 18, 1880.

Hon. James A. Garfield.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Your favor of the 12th came safely, and was carefully read. The documents referred to also reached me in due course. Please accept my thanks. You ask my opinion "in regard to their merits in answering the charges against you." Part of the papers I had seen before, but I have re-read them, and studied them all with the view of digesting your defense.

I am disappointed with the answer and refutation for which I had waited so long. One of the objections to your defense is, that you simply review the old matter and the old testimony from your standpoint. If a man is tried for a crime and is found guilty by a jury of his friends, and afterwards appeals to a higher court, or to the people, he is expected to produce new evidence and new arguments, and in the presence of his accuser. You have done neither. You waited until your accuser—Mr. Ames—was dead, and then simply submitted your own individual arguments and imperfect explanations, ex parte, to your constituents and others, many of whom have forgotten the points as originally brought out at Washington, and after covering forty-eight closely printed columns with your explanation, you close by saying: "In conclusion, the whole of this controversy is a simple matter of veracity between me and Oakes Ames." Now that leaves the case just where it was before you began to explain. In the spring of 1873 the Poland committee examined many credible witnesses, and after hearing your sworn testimony and that of Mr. Ames declared you guilty.

In the De Golyer matter your defense is also weak. You have not satisfactorily accounted for that \$5,000. You state that you "would at least have had too much respect for your own ambition to have done such a thing." You certainly know others who also had respect for their ambition and risked being caught in crime, who fell. Again, you fall back on your native statement that you "did not know there was a scheme," you

"were not aware of the relation of the Credit Mobilier to the Pacific Railroad," &c. Now, it seems to me, that as a member of Congress, it was your duty to know. If a gentleman of your broad experience in Congressional matters did not even suspect these men, what protection can the people rely upon from you against schemers and thieves should you be elected President? I was in hopes you could have made a better defense, but in my humble opinion it will not do. Respectfully yours,

H. H. HADLEY.

GRANT vs. HANCOCK.

Some Charges that Grant might now Explain.

Washington Gazette.

Grant, in the Fowler talk, speaking of General Hancock, says:

"He went South and removed the Governor and Commissioners that General Sheridan appointed. I instantly telegraphed him not to appoint to office any man who had been removed, and to give his reasons by mail for removing the men. He telegraphed in a long reply, stating the government \$250, his reasons. I telegraphed him that the reasons were not sufficient; to send by mail other reasons. He again telegraphed about the same points, only not quite so long, costing only \$150."

The charge that Hancock removed the Levee Commissioners appointed by Sheridan is absolutely false in all its parts, and in that respect is consistent with all Grant's other accusations.

Sheridan appointed a "new board of Levee Commissioners, May 3, 1867." Grant eulogized him for that act, and said in the Fowler interview his selections were "good men," who replaced bad men. On the 27th of July, 1867, Sheridan "re-instituted the old board of Levee Commissioners," who had been previously turned out, as Grant alleges, because they tried corruptly to negotiate the levee bonds.

Sheridan was relieved from command September 1, 1867. Hancock assumed command November 29, 1867, when he issued his famous order No. 40, or four months after the transactions, in which he could by no possibility have participated. With this regard for the truth of history, the value of Grant's attack on Hancock may be easily estimated.

While speaking of Gen. Hancock's extravagance in telegraphing, Grant should have explained why he built at government expense a stable for his private horses at a cost of about \$40,000. He should also explain why his brother Orestis is upon the Chicago Postoffice payroll (as reported) and not allowed to discharge the duties of the office while he gets the pay. It might be well for this great American Caesar to say why he has pensioned upon the people's treasury all of his and his wife's relatives. Also, why in 1876-7 he accumulated thousands of troops at the National Capital at the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars to attempt to intimidate the representatives of the American people.

We have carefully read Grant's so-called talk with the "Reverend" "Missionary Secretary" of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and fail to see a confession of his own misdeeds—to wit:

He says nothing about the \$100,000 he received from A. T. Stewart of New York, for appointing him Secretary of the Treasury and of his own ignorance of his ineligibility.

He fails to explain why he accepted Belknap's resignation as Secretary of War, for selling post-trader ships, while declaring against letting any "guilty man escape."

He never mentions upon his own connection with Attorney-General (Laundauet) Williams.

He ignores his connection with Alex. R. Shepherd and the District of Columbia swindling-ring.

He is mum as an oyster about the doings of his private Secretary Babcock.

He fails to give an inventory of the presents he received while in office and what returns he made by a reckless bestowal of public offices in return.

Not a word does he say about that Long Branch cottage, Tom Murphy, or the New York Custom-House.

Grant also fails to give an explanation why he promoted his son Frederick, who has never seen service, over the heads of officers who were in the army before he (Fred) was born.

We could go on by the column to indict Grant for "irregularities" in office, but what we have cited is sufficient to nauseate the people and hence we forbear upon your account.

"I would some power the little else, To send myself as others see us!"

GEN. HANCOCK TO DIE.

Now the cry of the Republicans is that Gen. Hancock will not live out more than one-half his Presidential term—and some put the period of his endurance much shorter—and then Mr. English will become President.

Very well; we will be content with what we get of Hancock, and then we will put up with English.

We shall shed no tears over Hancock in advance. All men are mortal. All may die. Hancock may

die; but he does not look much as if he were in a decline.

Still, as an independent and fair newspaper, we must frankly admit that in one respect the Republicans have an advantage—if it is an advantage—over us. They have a candidate for President on whom any candidate for Vice-President, coming into power, would be an improvement.

We have not. So says the New York Sun.

WRIGHT AND WILSON.

Jackman Willig and Tribune.

The canvass between Judge Wright the Democratic nominee for Governor and Mr. Wilson, the bolter, is unusually animated and is attracting the attention, and arousing the interest of everybody. One of the most important differences between the State credit and no credit man was as to the method of testing the legality of disputed bonds. The former insisting that it should be settled by some competent legal tribunal, and the bolter that the people should act as judge and jury in deciding it. The State credit Democrats proposed to have the legal status of the different bonds settled, as a guide to settlement, but not to interfere with the sovereign right of the State to deal with her debt after all disputed questions as to its validity were settled. At Springfield Judge Wright asked Wilson how he stood on this proposition, and to make it emphatic repeated it as follows:

Judge Wright then said, "No dodging the question on this. Col. Wilson, I ask you the clear cut question: Will you throw open the courts and let the bondholders sue the State, and if they shall determine that the railroad bonds are valid obligations of the State, will you agree that they shall be paid by the State?"

Mr. Wilson, in answer to this direct interrogatory, said: "I am willing as far as the State in her sovereign capacity can consent to allow the question of the legality of the bonds to be tested in the courts, and whatever the result is, I will agree to abide by it, and to pay what the courts may decide she owes."

At Clarksville, Erie, and at Paris, the reports published show that Wilson denied making the admission. At Dresden Judge Wright charged this admission on him last Monday and dared him to deny it. The reports show he did not deny it there. The presumption is that Judge Wright has in his pocket a few hundred affidavits from Springfield, which Wilson does not wish to face. We have seen Capt. John W. Morton, the gallant artilleryman of Fort-ress's old command, and he with a number of equally reliable gentlemen who were present, assured us that Wilson used the above language at Springfield. His subsequent denials show that he is not a man who can be relied upon to stand up for what he says before the people, and could not safely be trusted in the gubernatorial chair. He further stated as a reason for refusing to refund the \$100,000 dog tax illegally collected from the people after it was declared unconstitutional, that the State would have to refund the \$180,000 illegally collected from Railroads under the same act. Judge Wright produced the journals of the Legislature and showed that Wilson introduced a bill and helped pass it to refund the \$180,000 to the Railroads, while he voted to keep the \$100,000 illegally collected from the people.

WASHINGTON AND GARFIELD.

"We rebuke the theories of Mr. Garfield," said Horatio Seymour recently "with words taken from the Farewell Address of Washington."

If Washington's words rebuke Garfield's theories, how much more does Washington's life rebuke Garfield's practices?

Summon up the august effigy of the Father of his Country; the man first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen; the steadfast soldier, the unselfish patriot, the just and wise President, the stainless gentleman!

Then contemplate James Abram Garfield, the sleek politician, the betrayer of his friend, the bribe taker and the false swearer!

Then try to realize the import and bearings of the fact that a large minority of the people of the United States are trying to seat this man in the chair of George Washington!

Barroom Statistics.

In what part of the Union is there the most drunkenness? Every school-boy will promptly answer, "At the South, in Georgia and Texas and Alabama." Wrong, entirely wrong, if the number of retail liquor dealers is an index to the comparative sobriety of the people. There are two rumshops for every man, woman and child in Massachusetts, and yet they together are, if anything, more thickly settled with them than the rest of the late Confederacy. Texas has one gin mill to every 420 inhabitants, Georgia one to every 500, and the same as South Carolina, Arkansas, Mississippi and

Virginia, while in North Carolina there is but one to every 800, and even in Bourbon county itself there is only one to every 450. Contrast these figures with those of the Northern States. Here in New York we have one barroom to every 200 inhabitants—the same as in Ohio—and this seems to be the average hereabouts, the proportion in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland and Rhode Island, like that of Connecticut, varying very little from this. Maine and Vermont make a better showing, the former having but one for every 1,000 of her population, and the other one for every 750. The natural inclinations of the people are, however, interfered with in these two communities to such an extent as to deprive the statistics of all value.—N. Y. Graphic.

The Crookedness of Wilson.

McIntire's Southern Standard.

Mr. Wilson voted against returning the \$120,000 dog tax to the poor people from whom it had been taken wrongfully, and then introduced a bill himself to return \$180,000 taken unconstitutionally from the railroads, and to pay them interest on all of it except the amount they owed as taxes. Yet Wilson claims to be the friend of the people against railroads. Well may the people adopt the language of Mr. Van Buren, and exclaim: "Save us from our friend!"

But the crooked part is yet to come. When Judge Wright charged Mr. Wilson at Springfield with voting against the return of the dog tax of \$120,000, he excused himself by saying that the reason why he did not vote to return it was, that it would open the way to returning \$180,000 to the railroads, which he did not wish to do, although it was wrongfully taken from them just as the dog tax was, both laws having been decided unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Rotten and corrupt as this subterfuge is in point of morality, it turns out that Mr. Wilson did not desire to retain the \$120,000 railroad tax, but that he himself, according to the Journals of the Legislature, introduced the bill to return the \$180,000 to the railroads by giving them credit for so much of it as would pay what they owed as taxes and paying the balance back to them in money with interest. If Mr. Wilson is a friend to the people why did he not allow them to credit on the tax books too, like he did the railroads? But he voted to allow neither credit, the money, nor interest, took a part himself as a useless lawyer's fee without submitting any of the matter to the people.

For proof, see Senate Journal of 1879, page 631, and House Journal of 1877, pages 285, 317, 318, 336, 337. See Acts 1877, chapter 19, page 52.

Don't talk about Wilson's duplicity in the dog tax and railroad affair as a campaign document, but see whether he was for the railroads and against the people; and whether he stated the truth or not when he gave his reasons for voting against the latter in his speech at Springfield; and whether that statement appears to be intentional or not; and if so, whether it deceived the people or got.

These are facts one way or the other, such as no candidate for Governor of Tennessee ever had charged against him.

Newspapers and public speakers may mistake things, but the Journals of the Senate and House do not. Examine them and see what they say of Mr. Wilson's voting, and how he favors the people by submitting nothing to them, not even the money that the Supreme Court decided belonged to them.

It was Mr. Garfield who said from his seat in Congress:

"He who gets up the old sectional issue will find himself without a following."

It was Mr. Conkling, (repeating the party Shibboleth), who said in his New York speech the other night:

"The question presented by the campaign is purely sectional."

The "following" is growing "small by degrees, and beautifully less." Under all the circumstances of the outlook, no wonder the New York Times is moved to say:

If we have occasion at all times to deplore that our public men are politicians rather than statesmen, we have special cause for regret on this account during an active political canvass. Then more than ever are they disposed to take a narrow view of the perpetual contest between parties; to appeal to prejudices and fears rather than to rational convictions; to excite the passions rather than to persuade the intellect.

According to the Paris *Intelligence* "the bolters are bolting each other in Weakley county. They have two candidates for the legislature. One fact is very evident, there are not offices and places enough in the State for all the bolters who want office, and want it mightily bad. Office is at the bottom of the bolt."

A lamp is in a bad temper when it is put out.

New Advertisements.

Lewis & Carhart,

WHOLESALE GROCERS,

KNOXVILLE, TENN.

We have unsurpassed facilities for supplying the trade with

STAPLE & FANCY GROCERIES,

At New York prices—freight added.

AGENTS FOR HOLSTON SALT AND PLASTER CO.

LENOIR'S and ROCKFORD YARNS.

Plenty of Storage Room. Orders by mail carefully and promptly attended to. aug19/80

KNOXVILLE

Foundry and Machine Company,

Successors to ROGAN, KELLEY & CO.

KNOXVILLE, - - - TENNESSEE.

MANUFACTURERS OF

MILL GEARING OF EVERY DESCRIPTION,

Circular Saw Mills,

And all kinds of Cuttings for upright Saw Mills and Carriages.

Steam Engines Built and Repaired.

HOLLOW-WARE A SPECIALTY. AND THE NICEST AND BEST MADE IN THE SOUTH.

Fronts and Grates of all Sizes,

Side Hill Plows and Plow Castings, Cane Mills,

Railroad Castings, Brass Castings, Door Sills, Window Sills, Sash Weights, Columns, Street and Ventilating Grates, and Builders' Castings generally.

AGENTS FOR THE

Eclipse Double Turbine Water-Wheel,

Stiffel's Lime Extracting Heaters, and Judson's Standard Governors for Steam Engines.

Castings of every description made to order and Machinery of all kinds repaired properly and with dispatch. We invite persons having any class of work to do in our line to give us a call. aug19/80

HOPE & BRO.,

Watchmakers and Jewelers,

COR. GAY AND CLINCH STS., KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Keep in stock a full line of

Watches & Jewelry, Solid Silver, Silver-Plated Ware

Superior Table Cutlery, &c.

Repairing and Engraving skillfully executed